IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 7539 of 2004

For Approval and Signature:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.K.BUCH

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : YES

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

RAJYABHAI @ RAJUBHAI MOHANBHAIKOLI PATEL,THRO' D.M. PATEL
Versus
STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:
1. Special Civil Application No. 7539 of 2004
MR SUNIL C PATEL for Petitioner No. 1
MS HB PUNANI, AGP for Respondent No. 1-3

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.K.BUCH

Date of decision: 06/12/2004

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. Heard ld. counsel Mr. Sunil C.Patel for the petitioner who is the brother of the detenu. By this petition under Article 226 read with Articles 21 & 22(5)

of the Constitution of India, the petitioner who is brother of the detenu has challenged the legality and validity of the order of detention dated 20.05.2004 passed by the District Magistrate, Navsari, in exercise of the powers conferred on him by Section 3(2) of The Gujarat Prevention of Anti-Social Activities Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as the PASA Act) against the petitioner-detenu. The detenu has been branded as "boot-legger" as defined under Sec.2(b) of the PASA Act.

2. The grounds for detention supplied to the detenu petitioner indicate that the detenu was found involved in solitary single offence punishable under Sections 66B, 65AE, 116 of the Bombay Prohibition Act being Bilimora Police Station CR No. 78/2004, wherein 3100 bottles of liquor worth Rs.98,400/ was recovered. It is recorded by the authority that the petitioner is a "boot-legger" and is involved in the activities dangerous to the society. It is submitted that for recording subjective satisfaction by the detaining authority, the sponsoring authority had not produced any statements of the witnesses whereby it can legitimately inferred that the activities of the detenu were prejudice to the maintenance of the public order or of public health.

3. The petitioner has challenged the legality and validity of the order of detention on number of grounds as mentioned in the memo of the petition. Ld. counsel Mr. Patel for the petitioner, has taken this Court through the contentions raised in the petition. However, he has focussed his arguments mainly on two grounds. The first ground pressed into service by ld. counsel Mr. Patel is that the detenu has been wrongly branded as "bootlegger" and his activities are dangerous to maintenance of public order, as he was involved in solitary offence under Bombay Prohibition Act. The second ground pressed into service is that as per the settled legal position of the decision of the Apex Court in the case of Sohanlal Surajram Visnoi v/s State of Gujarat & Ors., 2004(2) GLR 1051, the impugned order of detention requires to be quashed as the case the present case is squarely covered by the ratio of the aforesaid decision.

5. I have gone through the above-cited decision. For the sake of convenience, I would like to quote relevant paras 4 & 5 of the said decision:-

"4. Article 22(3) of the Constitution of India expressly provides that the safeguards contained in Art.22(1) and 22(2) of the

Constitution are not to apply to preventive detention. Article 22(4) of the Constitution provides and opens with double negative, put in positive form, and in its real substance, means that a law which provides for preventive detention for a period longer than three months, shall contain all the provisions prescribed in clauses (4) and (5) of Article 22 of the Constitution. Article 22(5) of the Constitution prescribes that when any person under a preventive detention law is detained, the authority making the order, shall as soon as may be, communicate to such person, the grounds on which the order has been made, and shall afford him with the earliest opportunity of making a representation against the order. Article 22(5) of the Constitution is of general importance and operation in respect of every detention order made under any preventive detention law.

5. In this group of petitions, all the detenus, except one in Special Civil Application No.825 of 2003, are treated and described as "bootleggers" as defined under Sec.2(b) of the P.A.S.A. Act and only one offence is registered against each detenu under the provisions of the Bombay Prohibition Act, 1949. Whereas in Special Civil Application No.825/2003, the detenu is treated as "dangerous person" as defined in Sec.2(c) of the P.A.S.A. Act, and in this case also, a solitary incident is made basis for passing the detention order against him."

6. The next ground pressed into service by ld. counsel Mr. Patel is that for recording subjective satisfaction by the detaining authority, the sponsoring authority had not produced any statements of the witnesses whereby it can legitimately be inferred that the activities of the detenu are prejudicial to maintenance of public order or of public health and the detenu can be branded as "boot-legger" I agree with the submissions of ld. AGP Ms. Punani that it is not legally necessary to record such statement or to produce the witness before the detaining authority, but when the detaining authority has mainly concentrated on the registration of a solitary offence for recording subjective satisfaction, absence of such statement may also affect adversely to the validity of the order of detention. For, short absence of cogent and convincing material also has vitiated the order of detention. So, on both this grounds, impugned order of detention

requires to be quashed and set aside.

7. For the reasons aforesaid, this petition is allowed. Impugned order of detention dated 20.05.2004 passed by the District Magistrate, Navsari is hereby quashed and set aside and detenu is hereby ordered to be set at liberty forthwith if he is not required to be detained in any other case. Rule is made absolute.

Direct Service is permitted.

[C. K.BUCH, J]

*rawal